

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JORGE NAVARRO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B192597

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. PA051628)

THE COURT:^{*}

Jorge Navarro, also known as Manuel Valencia, appeals from the judgment entered following his plea of no contest to possession for sale of heroin (Health & Saf. Code, § 11351),¹ entered after he withdrew his plea of not guilty when his Penal Code section 1538.5 motion to suppress was denied. The facts upon which the motion to suppress was based are as follows:

On April 4, 2005, at approximately 1:45 p.m., Los Angeles Police Officer Donald Goossens saw two cars, one closely following the other, proceeding southbound on

*

BOREN, P. J., DOI TODD, J., CHAVEZ, J.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Health and Safety Code unless otherwise indicated.

Woodley Avenue. The cars made a left turn, went 50 yards and stopped near each other. This area was known for narcotics activity. Officer Goossens recognized the driver of the second car, Ronnie Steins, whom he knew to be a heroin addict. Appellant was in the passenger seat of the lead car.

Steins exited his car, ran to appellant's car and did a hand-to-hand exchange; appellant accepting currency from Steins and handing him something. In Officer Goossens experience, these circumstances were consistent with a narcotics transaction.

Steins reentered his car, made a U-turn and drove away. When appellant's car left, it made a turn without using his turn signal. Officer Goossens positioned his vehicle to block the street and stop appellant's car. He made the stop, believing he had just witnessed a narcotics transaction.

Officer Goossens and his partner removed the driver and appellant from the car and handcuffed and detained them. Officer Goossens then asked for the car registration. The driver said that the car belonged to appellant, and appellant said that it belonged to a friend and was lent to him. When the officer looked for the registration in the glove compartment, he saw a sock in the glove compartment molding. He knew socks were frequently used to hold money and narcotics. Inside the sock he found a number of balloons containing heroin or cocaine. He also found a cell phone in the car and an electronic scale, a pay and owe sheet and cash of \$380. The cell phone, which appellant said was his, rang repeatedly. When an officer answered it, the caller asked for narcotics to be delivered.

Appellant was charged with two counts of possession of controlled substances (§ 11351) and two counts of transportation of controlled substances (§ 11352, subd. (a)).

The trial court placed appellant on three years formal probation.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an "Opening Brief" in which no issues were raised. On December 18, 2006, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.